

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/528,682	03/20/2000	Mariagrazia Pizza	0342.105	5794
27476	7590 11/15/2001			
Chiron Corporation Intellectual Property - R440 P.O. Box 8097 Emeryville, CA 94662-8097			EXAMINER	
			BORIN, MICHAEL L	
				<del></del> _
Emery vine, Ort 94002 0097			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	0
			DATE MAILED: 11/15/2001	9
				Į.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/528,682** 

Applicant(s)

Pizza et al.

Examiner

Michael Borin

1631

		Wilchael Borin	1031		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the corres	pondence address		
A SHOTHE N - Exter aft - If the be - If NO co - Failur - Any r	for R_ply ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days considered timely. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory mmunication. The term of the term	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, in cation.  s, a reply within the statutory minimum period will apply and will expire SIX (6)  y statute, cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will b) MONTHS from the mailing date of this ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status 1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 10, 2	2001	·		
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) X This ac	tion is non-final.			
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposi	tion of Claims				
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>7-29</u>	is/are	pending in the application.		
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/ar	e withdrawn from consideration.		
5) 🗌	Claim(s)		is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>7-29</u>		is/are rejected.		
7) 🗆	Claim(s)		is/are objected to.		
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restric	tion and/or election requirement.		
_	tion Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e objected to by the Examiner.			
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) 🗌 approved	b)☐ disapproved.		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.			
13)□ a)□	under 35 U.S.C. § 119  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p  All b) Some* c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.			
	2. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents hav 3. $\square$ Copies of the certified copies of the priority d				
	3. L. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bure et the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	this National Stage		
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(	e).		
Attachm	ent(s)				
15) 💢 No	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summery (PTO-413) Paper	No(s)		
, ,	stice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application	(PTO-152)		
17) 💢 Inf	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	20) Other:			

Art Unit: 1631

**DETAILED ACTION** 

Status of the claims

1. Response to restriction requirement filed 9/10/01 is acknowledged. Applicant's

traverse is deemed persuasive and the restriction requirement is withdrawn. Claims

7-29 are examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement filed 8/8/2000 has been received

and entered into the application. Accordingly, as reflected by the attached completed

copies of forms PTO-1449, the cited references have been considered.

Abstract

3. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by

37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

**Drawings** 

4. The drawings are objected because of the defects noted on the PTO-948.

Art Unit: 1631

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 7-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The claims are drawn to polynucleotides encoding a sequence of subunit A of E.Coli toxin, LT-A, wherein Ala residue at position 72 is replaced with Arg residue; further, the claims are drawn to corresponding vectors and host cells. As there is a plurality of LT-A proteins and only proteins having a replaced Ala residue in position 72 are subject of invention, the presence of Ala/Arg in position 72 is critical and essential to the practice of the invention. However, no particular LT-A having sequence with Ala or Arg in the indicated position 72 is included in the claims or enabled by the disclosure. Multiple descriptions in the prior art cited in the specification refer to plurality of products, not necessarily comprising Ala<sup>72</sup>. For example, specification, p. 5, line 25 +, describes LT-A proteins having not Ala<sup>72</sup>, but a residue "which corresponds to Ala<sup>72</sup>". However, no particular LT-A having sequence with Ala in the indicated position is included in the claims or is present in the specification. Accordingly, the claims and the specification lack the See In re Mayhew, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA essential subject matter. 1976).

Art Unit: 1631

There is no incorporation by reference of any particular sequence. Even if there was an attempt to incorporate a sequence by reference, it would have been

improper as MPEP 608(p) clearly defines that

"Essential material" is defined as that which is necessary to (1) describe the claimed invention, (2) provide an enabling disclosure of the claimed invention, or (3)describe the best mode (35 U.S.C. 112). In any application which is to issue as a U.S. patent,

essential material may not be incorporated by reference.

6. Claims 7-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing

subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the

application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are

drawn, in part, to polynucleotides encoding immunogenic fragments of LT-A

comprising at least five residues. There is no description in the claims or

specification describing said fragments in such detail that will sufficiently identify

the epitope sequence required for the fragment to retain immunogenic properties.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C.102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1631

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States...

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7,11,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as clearly anticipated by Domenighini et al (WO 93/13202).

Domenighini describes a polynucleotide encoding LT-A subunit having Ala at position 72 substituted with Arg residue and corresponding vector and expression cells. See p.46, line 51, and page 45.

8. Claims 7-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 145486.

Art Unit: 1631

The patent teaches compositions and vaccines comprising modified LT-A of the following original sequences, respectively:

1 MKNITFIFFI LLASPLYANG DRLYRADSRP PDEIKRSGGL MPRGHNEYFD

51 RGTQMNINLY DHARGTETGF VRYDDGYVST SLSLRSAHLA GQFILSGYST

101 YYIYVIATAP NMFNVNDVLG VYSPHPYEQE VSALGGIPYS QIYGWYRVNF

151 GVIDERLHRN REYRDRYYRN LNIAPAEDGY RLAGFPPDHQ AWREEPWIHH

201 APQGCGNSSR TITGDTCNEE TQNLSTIYLR EYQSKVKRQI FSDYQSQVDI

The referenced protein comprises sequence TGFVRYDDG (underlined), which is a fragment of subunit LT-A having Arg residue instead of Ala. As the referenced protein presents a practical interest, as it can be used as an immunogenic stimulant and vaccine, one would be motivated to produce such protein recombinantly using conventional methods of molecular biology. Further, in regard to the second immunogenic component, because combination therapies for generation of immune response are well-known in the art and because it would have been desirable to use plural therapies in order to maximize the effectiveness of the treatment, it would be prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to be motivated to use the immunogenic subunit LT-A in combination with another immunogenic antigen. Modification to combine components all known to be useful as immunogenic agents would have been obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition which is to be useful for the very same purpose. Consequently, it would have been obvious to produce such conjugate protein recombinantly using conventional methods of molecular biology.

Art Unit: 1631

## Conclusion.

9. No claims are allowed

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (703) 305-4506. Dr. Borin can normally be reached between the hours of 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST Monday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Woodward, can be reached on

(703) 308-4028. The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

November 12, 2001

mlb

MICHAEL BORIN, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINED